

INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

2007-2008 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT FOR:

Brain Hurricane

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications	<i>Satisfactory</i>	Lesson matches original description	3 <i>Meets Standards</i>	Criminal Background Checks	<i>Non compliance</i>
Recruiting Materials	<i>Satisfactory</i>	Instruction is clear	2.5 <i>Between Approaching Standards and Meeting Standards</i>	Health/safety laws & regulations	<i>In Compliance</i>
Academic Program	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	Time on task is appropriate	3 <i>Meets Standards</i>	Financial viability	<i>In Compliance</i>
Progress Reporting	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	2.5 <i>Between Approaching Standards and Meeting Standards</i>		
Assessment and Individual Program Design	<i>Satisfactory</i>	Student/instructor ratio: 3-2:1	3 <i>Meets Standards</i>		

Due to violations of IDOE's criminal history check policy, Brain Hurricane has been placed in technical/compliance corrective action for the 2008-2009 school year. As such, Brain Hurricane has been required to implement corrective actions to address all areas of concern.

On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Brain Hurricane
REVIEWER: S.T.

DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED: April 7, 2008

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component during the site visit. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers will be given an Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory for each component. Providers receiving an Unsatisfactory for any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Tutor qualifications	BOTH of the following: -Tutor resumes/applications (<u>all tutors</u>) -Documentation of professional development opportunities in which tutors have participated (i.e. sign-sheets, agendas, presentations, certificates of completion, etc.) <i>In addition to:</i> ONE of the following: -Tutor evaluations (<u>all tutors</u>) -Recruiting policy for tutors (<u>one copy</u>) -Sample tutor contract (<u>one copy</u>)	-Training Handbook -Tutor Contract -Tutor Resumes		X	-Training Handbook provides resources and guidelines regarding curriculum implementation, positive reinforcement, assessment implementation, classroom management, communication with parents and other details essential to effective implementation of provider's program; -Tutor resumes are in line with tutor qualifications described in provider's application.
Recruiting materials	TWO of the following: -Advertising or recruitment fliers -Incentives policy -Program description for parents	-Recruitment flyer -Incentives policy -Parent description		X	-Parent description is appropriate and in line with provider's application; -Based upon the provider's Incentive Policy description, incentives do not exceed IDOE's incentive limits.
Academic Program	ONE of the following: -Lesson plan(s) for the observed tutoring session(s) and for each subject in which provider tutors <i>In addition to:</i> ONE of the following: -Specific connections to Indiana standards (cite exact IN standard to which lesson connects) -Description of connections to curriculum of EACH district the provider works with.	-Lesson plans -Description of connection to Indiana Academic Standards	X		-Lesson packets include directions and guidance for tutors to follow, a summary of the standards addressed in each lesson, and a number of interactive learning activities and worksheet materials to be used during lessons; -Standards listed on lesson plans correlate more with Iowa academic standards than with Indiana Academic Standards. For instance, a Kindergarten and Third grade lesson plan list Iowa standards rather than Indiana standards. The lessons were supposed to focus on Indiana's number sense standard (the same as

					Iowa's number properties and operations standard), however, the lessons actually focused on activities that fall under Indiana's computation standard.
COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Progress Reporting	<p>ALL of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Progress reports (see IDOE e-mail for details regarding the request for progress reports) -Timeline for sending progress reports -Documentation of reports sent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Progress reports -SES Contracts -SES Agreements -Timeline for progress reporting -Documentation of reports sent 	X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Based upon district feedback, provider submits timely progress reports to districts. However, based on the Individual Achievement Plans and progress reports, the provider does not appear to submit progress reports to parents in accordance to the timeframe agreed to in SES Contracts and Agreements; -Progress reports do not include all of IDOE's required components see memo regarding required Progress Report Components from December 2007). For instance, not all progress reports include an update on each student's progress towards goals. In addition, progress reports do not include assessment results which are also a required component of progress reports.
Assessment and Individual Program Design	<p>ALL of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Explanation of the process provider uses to develop Individual learning plans for each student - Pre-assessment scores and Individual learning plan for at least one student in each subject provider tutors (any identifying information for the student(s) must be blanked out) -Explanation and evidence regarding how provider's pre and post-test assessment correlates to Indiana academic standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Individual Learning plans and pre-assessment scores -Explanation of learning plan development process 		X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Learning plan development process is appropriate; -Learning plans include student goals, services and strategies planned to help students achieve goals, the evaluation mechanism that will be used to determine whether students have met their goals, anticipated levels of growth for each student, and a description of how parents and teachers will be continually updated; -Assessment appears to correlate with Indiana Academic Standards.

On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Brain Hurricane

SITE: Indianapolis Public School #15; South Wayne Elementary School

TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): D.E., R.C., & S.N; H.G. & A.W.

NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 5

DATE: March 13, 2008; March 25, 2008

REVIEWER: S.T. & K.S.

TIME OF OBSERVATION: 4:00 p.m.; 4:10 p.m.

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a score of 1-4 points for each component. Providers receiving “1 or 2 points” on any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application			X		<p>-Five small groups of students were observed working with their tutors at two different sites. At one site three groups were observed. One group of students played a game about word pronunciation and also watched a Brain Hurricane video on word sounds and consonants. A second group of students worked on properly identifying geometric shapes that they either drew on white boards or selected from shapes laid out on a table in the room. A third group of students worked on an interactive math activity to help them identify the area and perimeter of objects. At another site two groups were observed. One group worked with their tutor on math problems on factors using white boards and small group discussion. The second group worked on language arts lessons using vocabulary words they'd recently learned, sight words, identifying syllables and also read a story together.</p> <p>-The observed lessons were in line with the description in the provider's application. As described in the application, students were observed participating in activity oriented lessons that involved educational games, small group activities, and interactive lessons.</p>
Instruction is clear		2.5			<p>-In four out of five lessons observed, tutors clearly communicated to students what was to be learned during the lesson and also shared their expectations for students in terms of behavior and student participation. However, in one of the observed sessions in which students were playing a word pronunciation game with their tutor, the tutor did not clearly articulate expectations or objectives for the lesson. Students in this group did not appear to have an adequate understanding of what was to be accomplished by engaging in the lesson. Students did not appear to understand that the purpose of the activity was to correctly identify and pronounce words not to move to as many different seats as they</p>

					<p>could (they were playing a game and if they mispronounced a word from a note card, they had to move to another seat).</p> <p>-In three out of the five sessions observed, tutors effectively used tutoring strategies such as adjusted instruction and modified correction to facilitate the understanding of new or difficult concepts. However, in two of the sessions, tutors did not effectively rely on these strategies to clarify instruction. For instance, in the lesson with students playing a word identification and pronunciation game, when a student mispronounced a word and it was clear none of the other students knew the word, the tutor acknowledged no one had correctly pronounced the word and said the word instead of providing students with strategies to help them determine how to correctly identify and pronounce words on their own. In addition, while the three students may have been grouped based on ability levels identified in their pre-tests, it was clear that there were still differences in ability levels within the group that tutor might have been able to address by using adjusted or modified instruction techniques. Also, in another lesson where students worked on identifying geometric shapes, the tutor told each student when they had incorrectly identified a shape but did not provide clarification on why the shape they selected was wrong (i.e. why is the box a student selected not the correct shape for a sphere?) or provide tips students could use in the future to correctly identify shapes. So, although students knew they had guessed incorrectly, they lacked clarity on why the shapes they selected were wrong and were not provided with strategies they could use to correctly identify shapes.</p>
COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Time on task is appropriate			X		<p>-In four out of five lessons, students were actively involved in their lessons and paid attention to instruction being provided. If a student became distracted, even briefly, the tutors quickly redirected students. However, in one lesson, even though two of the three students actively participated in the word identification/pronunciation game, one of the students was constantly disengaged in the lesson (head down or watching other groups in the room) even though the tutor made several mild attempts to get the student to focus on his/her lesson (see more in "Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable section").</p>
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable		2.5			<p>-In three of the five lessons observed, it was clear the tutors were not only familiar with their lesson plans and the materials being presented to students but they also knew how to appropriately modify instruction or rely on a variety of other tutoring strategies to make the lessons engaging and promote time on task. For example, during the math lesson on factors, the tutor asked each student one at a time to "be the teacher" and explain how they solved a problem to him/her. The students really enjoyed being the teacher but this was also an effective method of verifying how much of the lesson students truly understood. Another example is that a tutor working on language arts lessons with students used "echo reading" to not only engage students but also to re-emphasize some</p>

					<p>of the vocabulary they had learned;</p> <p>-In two of the lessons, while tutors may have understood the materials being covered, it did not always appear that they were able to translate this into instruction. In addition, neither of the tutors had lesson plans available (although the activities they completed were in line with the lesson descriptions in the application). Also, these tutors were not observed effectively using tutoring techniques such as modified or adjusted instruction during lessons where these types of adaptations would have been beneficial to students. Lastly, the tutor working on the word identification/pronunciation game with students did not effectively use behavior management strategies or strategies to promote time on task. For instance, even when two students began arguing while playing the game, the tutor did not incorporate classroom management techniques to get the students back on track quickly and when the student that was disengaged from the lesson continued to watch other groups with his/her back to the tutor and his/her own group, the tutor did not use strategies to get the student more involved with the lesson.</p>
Student/instructor ratio: 3-2:1			X		<p>-Student/instructor ratio was in line with ratio range reported in the original provider application;</p> <p>-Small group instruction was observed.</p>

On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric COMPLIANCE Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Brain Hurricane
REVIEWER: S.T.

DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED: April 7, 2008

The following information is rated “Compliance” (C) or “Non-Compliance” (N-C). Selected documentation listed for each component must be submitted as part of the site visit monitoring. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider’s organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.**

If a provider is deemed to be in non-compliance with any component for which evidence has been requested, the provider may be contacted and may be required to develop and submit a corrective action plan for getting into compliance within 7 calendar days. If the corrective action plan is not submitted, if the corrective action plan is inappropriate or insufficient, or if the corrective action plan is not implemented, the provider may be removed from the state-approved list.

COMPONENT	REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE USE ONLY)	C	N-C
Criminal background checks	ALL of the following: -Criminal background checks from an appropriate source for every tutor and any other employees working directly with children.	-Criminal background checks (Some tutors did not have background checks prior to working with students, some tutors completed their own background checks)		X
Health and safety laws and regulations	ONE of the following: -Student release policy(ies) <i>In addition to:</i> ONE of the following: -Safety plans and/or records -Department of Health documentation of physical plant safety (if operating at a site other than a school) -Evacuation plans/policies (e.g., in case of fire, tornado, etc.) -Transportation policies (as applicable)	-Transportation policy -Student release policy	X	
Financial viability	ONE of the following: -Documentation of liability insurance coverage <i>In addition to:</i> ONE of the following: -Audited financial statements -Tax return for the past two years	-Verification of liability insurance -Audited financial statement	X	